



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/398,006	09/16/1999	YOICHI OKAMOTO	Q55806	9551

7590

11/26/2002

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

FISCHER, JUSTIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2002

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/398,006

Applicant(s)

OKAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Justin R Fischer

Art Unit

1733

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 14 November 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 14 November 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant contends that Barassi fails to disclose a belt structure "comprised of three rubberized cord layers each containing steel cords". As stated in the Final rejection (Paragraph 2), Barassi teaches a general belt structure having (a) "at least one metallic strip" between a first and second textile strip and (b) a radially outermost ply of steel cords that are inclined between 60 and 90 degrees. Thus, the reference is clearly directed to embodiments in which two or more metallic strips are disposed between said first and second textile strips, in which case the belt structure would "comprise" three rubberized cord layers each containing steel cords. It should be noted that the term "comprise" does not exclude the presence of additional belt layers and as such, any of the embodiments in which more than one metallic strip is disposed between said first and second textile strips, as suggested by Barassi, would have a belt structure "comprised" of three rubberized cord layers each containing steel cords. With respect to the axial extension of the outermost belt ply, as stated in the Final rejection (Paragraph 6), Barassi states that the radially outermost belt layer has a width that extends over the entire part of the ground contact area and provides adequate support for the tread blocks. Thus, since the tread blocks are defined by grooves, it is evident that in order for the radially outermost belt layer to "support the tread blocks", the radially outermost belt would necessarily be positioned axially outward of the tread blocks and the tread grooves.

Justin Fischer
11/22/02

Michael W. Ball
Michael W. Ball
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700